DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 794 95 SP 010 853

TITLE Towards Excellence in Elementary Education; A Program for Improving the Professional Growth Opportunities for Elementary Teaching Personnel.

INSTITUTION Lansing School District, Mich.; Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Coll. of Education.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.

PUB DATE 76
NOTE 30p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Education; *Elementary Education; *Elementary School Teachers; Inservice Teacher Education; Professional Continuing Education; *Student Teachers; Teacher Education; *Teacher Educators; *Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

The Excellence in Elementary Education (EEE) program provides a number of interdependent experiences aimed at optimizing the quality and availability of professional growth opportunities for persons specializing in elementary education: prospective teachers, inservice teachers, prospective teacher educators, and inservice teacher educators. The program is predicated upon the notion that outcomes will be most constructive when diverse sets of educators work together and share decision-making on how teaching and learning for any particular group of students might be improved. Recommendations are offered for the development and implementation of future EEE type programs. An essay on a first year's experience in an EEE program is attached. (MM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the micrcfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED135794

Towards

EXCELLENCE IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

A
Program
for

-- IMPROVING THE PROFESSIONAL GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES
FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHING PERSONNEL --

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP010 853

Cooperatively Designed and Supported By

USOE (Teacher Corps) + Lansing School District + Michigan State University

The Planning Committee members who prepared the attached description included the following persons from Lansing Schools and the College of Education at Michigan State University.

Barbara Ataman
Everett Elementary

Henrietta Barnes
Teacher Education

Cathy Colando
Gier Park Elementary

Judy Lanier
Teacher Education

Perry Lanier
Teacher Education

Roberta Peto
Everett Elementary

Carol Pratt
Willow Elementary

Joyce Putnam
Teacher Education

Diane Rouse
Gier Park Elementary

Erma Whiting
Gier Park Elementary

Further assistance and input to the planning was received from: Betty Brown, Judy Jennings, Barbara Langenbacher and Rena Moyer from Wexford Elementary, Janine Goalsby from Post Oak Elementary, and Quintella Walker from Willow Elementary.

WHAT IS THE "TRIPLE-E" PROGRAM?

The EEE program provides a set of interdependent experiences aimed at optimizing the quality and availability of professional growth opportunities for persons specializing in elementary education. The persons for whom it has been designed include (1) prospective teachers, (2) teachers-already-teaching, (3) prospective teacher-educators and (4) teacher-educators already teaching. A major assumption of the designers has been that the learning experiences for each unique set of participants are optimized when all participants engage in a set of simultaneous learning experiences. That is to say, a synergistic learning effect can occur for all when everyone participates as learner as well as teacher. Thus, the "EEE" acronym comes from the program's emphasis on personnel joining together to work for "Excellence in Elementary Education" with diverse professional perspectives in various professional contexts. The "Triple-E" program, therefore, should not be viewed as primarily a teacher preparation program or as an in-service program or as an improvement program for teacher educators. Rather, EEE should be viewed as all of these working in concert so that a set of desirable outcomes will accrue for children, educators and the Lansing community at large. The program is predicated upon the notion that outcomes will be most constructive when diverse sets of educators work together and share decision-making on how teaching and learning for any particular set of students might be improved -- be they children or adults.

A BRIEF BUT NECESSARY HISTORY

The program originated in the early seventies with the elementary education segment of the Triple-T project (TTT -- Training Teachers of Teachers). The TTT project was supported by USOE and cooperatively

designed and implemented by faculty in Michigan State University's College of Education and the Lansing School District. When TTT funding ended in 1973, the administrative personnel of both institutions, that is, MSU's College of Education and the Lansing School District, chose to provide continued support so that the promising ideas and practices initiated by the elementary TTT project might be continued. The TTT program (although no longer supported with USOE/TTT monies) continued and maintained itself for the next year but was unable to either expand or significantly improve itself since it was necessarily operating with limited funds. In the fall of 1974, the modest TTT project was merged with the Lansing/MSU Eighth Cycle Teacher Corps project and resulted in the realization of a unique set of opportunities and activities heretofore not considered possible by either individual project. That is to say, through combining the two projects, a number of more powerful means of providing for the mutual professional growth of teacher trainees, teachers and teacher educators was possible. One might say that the evolutionary EEE program was a product of good fortune, good problem-solving and goodwill.

The good fortune came from the practical staffing and time demands that created a problem relative to the availability of adequate personnel to operate both programs. The good problem-solving occurred when the participants saw the possibility and potential payoffs that might be gained from combining the two programs. The goodwill came from the many different persons -- the teacher candidates, teachers, administrators and teacher educators -- who struggled together to work out the intricacies of the logistically-complicated program.

A More Specific Elaboration

The TTT program was initially aimed at improving the quality of teacher preparation. One means of improving the quality of the teacher preparation program was to have both prospective teachers and teacher educators out in the schools for significantly greater periods of time than is typically allocated. Forty volunteers comprised the initial set of teacher candidates who observed and assisted Lansing teachers in the first term of their freshman year. They subsequently worked in schools every week of every term throughout their undergraduate years, with gradually increased amounts of responsibility, both in terms of time and teaching functions. Each candidate worked in four different Lansing schools throughout this time. The MSU teacher educators working in the program also made continuous and regular school observations, visitations and demonstrations. By the time the prospective teachers were beginning the senior year, they had 125% of the "practice" teaching (in schools with kids) experience usually acquired by the graduating senior in the conventional teacher education program. Hence, they were "prepared" in the conventional sense for a beginning teaching assignment. However, the TTT trainees had one year remaining for additional instruction and still "richer" supervised teaching experience.

In the meantime, the Teacher Corps program, which was also operating in Lansing, was similarly focused on teacher preparation, only with a special emphasis of recruiting and preparing minority teaching personnel. These prospective teachers entered the program in their junior year, but also had intensive school experience since their program required a half day in school every day throughout the academic year.

It happened that the need for and possibility of combining the two programs occurred when both sets of interns were in their senior year. Because of their prior preparatory experience, both sets of interns were relatively well-prepared for assuming substantial and significant portions of teaching responsibility. Given this factor and the healthy diversity of strengths and backgrounds, each Teacher Corps intern was paired with a "Triple-T" intern and they were subsequently teamed with a cooperating teacher in one of the participating schools. This provided the opportunity for a new team-teaching experience. Thus in the fall term of the interns' senior year, the three-person team (cooperating teacher, Teacher Corps intern and TTT intern, each alternating in the role of lead-teacher) taught the students assigned to a given classroom. Subsequently, in the winter term, one intern assumed the bulk of the teaching responsibility and in the spring term the other intern assumed the bulk of the teaching responsibility. In this way, all interns were able to prepare themselves for both a teamed and a relatively self-contained teaching situation. At all times, the cooperating teacher maintained <u>ultimate</u> teaching responsibility, in the sense of approving all planned goals and strategies proposed and implemented by the interns. Through this effort sharing, however, the cooperating teacher was able to acquire several days a week at which time his or her efforts could be directed toward continued professional development and curriculum development during the school day. (This latter aspect was one whose tremendous benefits we have especially come to value, but more will be said about this later.)

University personnel were in the participating schools working with the cooperating teachers and with the interns on a regular basis.

They always observed and assisted interns when the regular classroom teachers were participating in direct in-service instruction. Several teachers were also released by the school district to assist with the organization, observation and management of the various facets of the program.

Our Early Set of Worries

The original concerns shared by the participants who ventured into the combined program centered around the following issues:

- Will there be any deleterious effects on children with the added number of teaching adults in the classroom, or from the cooperating teachers' time away from the classroom?
- Will parents be upset with the experienced teacher leaving his/her classroom during the school day for "on-the-job" professional education and curriculum development?
- Will the interns work together cooperatively or competitively? (A special concern here was the fact that Teacher Corps interns were receiving a stipend plus tuition, while the Triple-E interns received no compensation and no tuition whatsoever.)
- Will teachers value and profit from the in-service activities and curriculum development? Can/will they help facilitate a productive interaction with the university professors and graduate students?
- Will principals be tolerant of all the traffic and potential confusion that may arise with interns, teachers and university personnel coming and going at all times?
- Will the teacher educators be both sensitive and strong enough to constructively respond to the various needs, requests and occasional demands of the school participants? Will they be tolerant of the increased pressures and inconveniences encountered from such things as the added travel requirements, teaching classes with frequent interruptions and sometimes in cramped spaces?

All of these "unknowns" were necessarily worrisome as we anticipated and planned the "trial activities. At the end of the 1974-75 year, however, the experiment was judged by those participating as a clear success.

While occasional problems arose, none of the major concerns and/or fears were realized.

There were no apparent deleterious effects to students or serious problems among or between the interns, teachers, administrators or teacher educators. To the contrary, the major response was quite overwhelmingly positive from all parties involved. While occasional conflicts and differences of opinion naturally occurred, they were resolved through continued problem-solving sessions. Thus, the decision at the end of the year was to continue refinement and development of the program; but the task was complicated by personnel limitations and necessary changes in the new Tenth Cycle Teacher Corps project.

The Readjustments

For the 1975-76 academic year, there was only one remaining set of prospective teachers (EEE seniors; we now began calling them EEE instead of TTT*) prepared to enter their fourth year with the necessary background and skills to team teach with and subsequently release a cooperating teacher. Further, the Tenth Cycle Teacher Corps program had shifted its emphasis entirely to graduate training and in-service teacher education and was to be focused on the concept of "total school involvement." (Prior to this time, there were six schools involved, with three to five cooperating teachers in each.) Thus, one school was selected with the teachers and administrators agreeing to participate in the in-service development and demonstration. The EEE seniors were all placed in the

*We simply tired of explaining how the TTT program, which was no longer in "actual" existence, related to the Teacher Corps Program, so we began referring to the combined program as EEE. We tried to select a name that suggested the earlier tie to TTT.

one school, giving them the opportunity for their team and self-containedd internship experiences and providing the needed instructional and developmental release time for the cooperating teachers.

In the fall term, all teachers and the principal participated with all MSU teacher educators in two half-days of in-service a week. Four graduate Teacher Corps interns also participated. The emphasis of the instruction was the psychological and sociological foundations of curriculum development for elementary school youngsters. In the winter and spring, the teachers and teacher educators each participated as a member of a study and curriculum development team in the area of reading, math, social-emotional or multi-cultural education. The development teams reviewed the relevant research literature in their respective curricular area and attempted to utilize the foundations guidelines in preparing model instructional units for demonstration. (A description of the teachers' reactions and suggestions regarding this aspect of the program is appended.)

The Program Planning Committee

In the meantime, however, a new set of EEE interns had to be recruited and prepared for the 1976-77 academic year if the program was to continue functioning in the manner described. Therefore, a number of teachers who had participated in the EEE program in prior years, but were excluded in 1975-76 due to the Teacher Corps "total school" priority, joined together to (1) help prepare the needed new set of interns for the 1976-77 "total school" participation and (2) design a long-range program of the sort described so that changes in national priorities and/or guidelines which might be disruptive, would not necessarily

terminate continuation of the program. Thus, while the Teacher Corps teachers and teacher educators were designing and developing curriculum and instruction for children and teachers in the "total school," the "other" teachers were engaged in overall program design and implementation.

PRESENT RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR FUTURE EEE

Program Goal: To provide continuous and improved professional growth experiences for personnel specializing in elementary education

The anticipated outcomes of the EEE program should include a set of benefits for all client groups involved in the educational enterprise, i.e.:

1. For children it should bring added personal and professional teaching attention and assistance.

2. For teachers it should bring assistance in classroom planning and instruction, released time for both curriculum and continuing professional development, new knowledge about teaching and learning, the opportunity to influence and effect both the selection and program of those entering teaching and direct participation in the design and instruction of their own in-service programs.

3. For prospective teachers it should provide early and diverse sets of gradually intensified field experiences which allow for continuous and consistent feedback and guidance from peers, teachers and teacher educators who cooperate in the planning of program goals and strategies.

4. For teacher educators it should provide the opportunity to teach their clients (pre- and in-service teachers) in the actual setting in which their learning is to be applied. This direct interaction with children, teachers and administrators should provide necessary input and feedback regarding the needs, problems and successes of their "students," i.e., the student-aides, student-teachers, student-interns, student-teacher-educators and cooperating teachers.

5. For administrators it should bring increased coordination of ancillary teaching personnel and potentially greater services in terms of the human resource needs for the school.

5. For administrators it should bring increased coordination of ancillary teaching personnel and potentially greater services in terms of the human resource needs of the school.

The Major Strategy

The major strategy of the unifed professional development program must contain three critical and inter-related elements:

1. early, intensified and consistent teacher education experiences provided for the prospective teacher in both public school and campus setting so that an extremely rich and responsible teaching-internship experience can be realized;

2. competent interns who are allowed to temporarily and on a part time basis release the cooperating teacher so that in-service professional development can become a natural and no cost part of the teacher's on-going professional responsibility;

3. on-site involvement of teacher educators who are both teaching and learning with the pre- and in-service teachers in the actual school environment.

This overall arrangement might well be described as a "community-of-learners" strategy.

The notion of community implies a common location, a common set of interests and various sets of individuals assuming different roles so that the interdependent needs of the larger population can be met with greater facility and benefit. Community also implies a sense of acceptance and valuing of the various members and the contributions each makes to the whole; that is, the inputs made by each unique set of participants are recognized as necessary and essential to the attainment of optimal outcomes for every individual.

A sense of common purpose is also shared by a community, and in this case the common purpose centers around the shared dedication to actualizing "what a teacher should be." This implies that the prospective teachers

and teacher educators and the already certified teachers and teacher educators continually strive together to identify (1) what appears needed by learners and (2) what in turn is needed by teachers in order to help students meet their needs. Such an approach is consistent with the Edelfelt and Lawrence belief that "a conceptual framework for in-service education should build on pre-service models, and both pre-service and in-service frameworks should be based on concepts of what a teacher should be." (Rethinking In-service Education, p. 17)

Logistics of the Program

For the program to become operational, a set of classroom teachers must necessarily be identified. So that travel time and transportation costs can be maintained at an efficient level for the prospective teachers and teacher educators, it is recommended that the program be operated in a school with from three to five cooperating teachers. The actual number of teachers in a given school would necessarily remain flexible, but must take into account a minimum number needed for efficiency and a concommitant spirit of community. Space and/or personnel limitations will naturally effect the choice of "how many."

Each member of the set of classroom teachers would have one sophomore aid in the morning and one in the afternoon for two half-days a week. S/he would also have one junior in the morning and one in the afternoon, who initially come for only three days a week, but increase to four or five days a week by the end of the year. In the following year, one of the former junior students -- now a senior intern -- remains a part of the team and provides the partial released-time for the cooperating teacher. The other senior intern will go to another teacher in the

system and, in turn, provide him or her released time for continued professional development.

Once the second year is underway, every year looks similar in that the classroom has a team of instructional personnel with graduated levels of expertise and skill. They share a common commitment to teaching elementary youngsters and to continuous professional growth and development. With the cooperating teacher as the lead teacher of the team, roles and responsibilities are cooperatively determined and made very explicit so that smooth team functioning can result in optimal teaching and learning experience for both children and adults. It is presently estimated that a minimum of one full time clinic professor is needed for each five classrooms to maintain a teaching team as has been described.

A comment is needed regarding the teaching intern who leaves the team in his/her senior year to release some "other" teacher in the system who is not an official cooperating teacher in the EEE program. The first priority, in terms of selecting the "other teacher(s)" who will receive the moving senior intern would be any EEE cooperating teacher who might have lost his or her senior intern due to illness, marriage, moving, career shift, etc. The second priority would be to send the moving senior interns to a school that had elected as a "total school" to become involved in in-service/continuing professional development (as has been done in the Lansing Teacher Corps School). The third priority would be to send the moving senior intern "elsewhere", in order to provide released time for teacher(s) needed and/or desiring time for continued professional development.

The Tough "Quality Control" Questions

It has been strongly recommended by the planning group that the difficult issues surrounding quality of program be faced just as forthrightly as those of quantity of program. How personnel should be selected for participation in the program is yet to be determined, but some initial suggestions have been made.

It is presently believed that some selection process beyond that of "get-volunteers-and-select-at-random" be employed. Experience has indicated, for example, that some of the following criteria should be considered in selecting the various participants for the program:

1. Prospective teachers:

Because the program is excessively demanding in terms of time and energy (due , in part, to the increased amount of field experience required), teacher candidates should be able to demonstrate a relatively high degree of efficiency and facility in their reading, writing and study skills. The college students who have had to expend great amounts of time and energy in laborious pursuit of related coursework have experienced great difficulty in keeping up with their teaching responsibilities in the school, be they tutorial or small group. Planning for instruction and preparing and selecting appropriate materials for children is necessarily time-consuming. The competing demands to do well in their own coursework and to concomitantly do well in their teaching of children has been more than most of the low/slow skilled college students have been able to effectively handle. Since children are the necessary priority, we cannot allow their growth and development to be jeopardized by participating in learning experiences conducted by less than able teacher interns.

Thus, it is recommended that a set of performance measures and standards relating to one's literary skills be identified as a selection criteria for admission of prospective candidates into the program. It is further recommended that tutorial assistance be available for students needing such assistance. At such time as they acquire the needed skills, the candidate be allowed to enter the program without penalty.

An additional selection recommendation for teacher candidates related to the amount of time they were willing and/or able to commit to the preparation program. The experience to date indicates that they need from six to nine terms available for on-going field experience in schools. Allowance for individual differences prevents establishment of an absolute rule, but for the candidate to have the set of broad and rich practice teaching experiences that are tied to acquired knowledge frameworks that become synthesized into one's teaching, a minimum of two academic years in the schools now appears essential. This limitation, for example, would necessarily prevent students from entering the program in the senior year unless, of course, they were willing to extend the amount of time they would give to their preparation experience.

Another recommended selection consideration relates to the diverse make-up of any given <u>set</u> of candidates. That is, each set of candidates admitted to the program should include diverse membership in terms of varied individual backgrounds and/or characteristics. Any selected set of candidates should, therefore, have persons of differing age, sex, ethnic and economic backgrounds represented in its composition. The rich interaction that occurs between and among prospective teachers from diverse experience bases is considered important for those preparing to teach diverse sets of learners. This recommendation may necessitate an

added recruitment and/or scholarship aspect to the program but is a value strongly held by the participants who worked with the earlier Teacher Corps and TTT interns.

A further recommendation relating to the prospective teacher participants concerns their grade point average. While they would be allowed to enter the program with the minimal "C" overall college average, it is anticipated that they would maintain a "B" overall average in the coursework offered under the sponsorship of the EEE program itself. Since the program coursework unifies the students' content, methods and practice courses (usually separate entities in conventional programs), it is their application of the knowledge in their professional teaching roles that should be maintained at a relatively high standard.

2. Participating Classroom Teachers:

The teachers selected to participate in the program would necessarily be those interested in (1) acquiring knowledge and skill in preparing prospective teachers and (2) pursuing in-service professional development in terms of acquiring new knowledge and skill in any of the following teacher roles and/or responsibilities: (university credit available on an optional basis)

a. Teacher as interacting instructor with children

b. Teacher as curriculum selector and developer

c. Teacher as teacher-educator

d. Teacher as formulator/designer of professional standards and practices

e. Teacher as professional evaluator

f. Teacher as educational researcher

g. Teacher as interacting agent with persons and groups from the school, community and/or state who effect educational means and ends

Further, they would necessarily be experienced teachers who come recommended by other professional educators with whom they have worked in the past. It is presently anticipated that each cooperating teacher would be involved with the program for a minimum of three years. It is recommended that a selection committee with teacher, administrator, and university personnel be assembled for continuing selection and evaluation of the "master" teachers needed for modeling and managing the complex teaching tasks necessitated by the program.

The cooperating teacher in the EEE program obviously needs highly effective human interaction and organization skills. Similarly, their openness to new and diverse people and ideas must be combined with a tolerance for ambiguity and a willingness to try new instructional approaches. In addition, they must be willing to be observed by many diverse persons, in various teaching roles. The continuing program evolution and evaluation necessitates such teacher qualities.

It should be noted that the classroom teacher being described here would be one of a team from a given school who would work with the sophomore, junior and senior teachers-in-preparation. This is to distinguish them from a classroom teacher who might work with only <u>one</u> senior intern, resulting in the teacher being temporarily released part-time for one or two terms of in-service professional development.

3. Participating Teacher Educators:

The teacher-educator participants must necessarily be those willing

to make continuous school visitations. Further, they must be willing to work in classrooms with pre- and in-service teachers, explicating and demonstrating with children, the teaching approaches being recommended. Like the classroom teacher, they must be comfortable being observed and receiving questions and feedback as well as observing others and giving feedback. The need for continuing constructive alternatives with all criticisms is essential for all participants, as is the need for highly-effective communication and organization skills.

The attitudes of the teacher-educators toward children, the public schools and the school personnel must necessarily be positive and respectful. Further, as it is the classroom teacher's responsibility to try new things, so it is the responsibility of the teacher educators' to be continuously current and knowledgeable regarding the field test results of the instructional approaches they recommend.

As in the case of the other program participants, (e.g., cooperating teachers) it is recommended that a selection committee with teachers, administrators and university personnel jointly determine the more precise selection and evaluation criteria and procedures.

4. Overall Program Criteria:

Recommendations for quality-control of the overall EEE program, like those for the individual participants, still require greater detail and precision but nevertheless represent an initial attempt to deal with the quality question. The criteria presently recommended for the overall program include the following:

I. It is to be academically sound in that:

1. All curricular and instructional recommendations will emanate from a thorough review of existing research literature on children's learning in the subject matter fields under development.

2. All curricular and instructional recommendations coming from the research and/or theoretical literature will be reviewed, field tested and refined by pilot sets of teachers prior to any broad scale implementation or dissemination effort.

3. The program will evaluate and report its effects through systematic data-gathering procedures that take into account cognitive and affective effects on pupils, interns, teachers, teacher educators, administrators and the community involved. The program will be responsive to its clients in that it will continually undergo modification until positive cognitive and affective gains are indicated for the participant groups.

II. It is to be ethically sound in that:

1. It will afford no loss of instructional quality to learners; (in fact, a gain in instructional quality should result).

2. It will afford no excessive demands on teacher work time or energy; (in fact, a gain in teacher time and energy should result).

3. It affords no loss of instructional quality to the persons preparing to teach; (in fact, a gain in instructional quality should result).

4. It will afford no loss of professional stature for each participant group -- interns, administrators, teachers, or teacher educators -- (in fact, a gain in respect for the various professional roles should result from sharing interdependent activities and mutual goals).

III. It is to be fiscally sound in that:

1. The program will afford no excessive demand for monies to release teachers for professional development.

2. The program will afford no excessive personal cost to the interns, teachers, teacher educators or administrators.

Our Present Set of Worries

At this point in time, the Planning Committee's recommendations for EEE continuation are going to the Lansing/MSU Teacher Center -- an organization made up of Lansing and MSU teachers and administrators who review all inter-institutional, school-related projects. They, in turn, will make recommendations to their respective institutions, i.e., the Lansing School District, MSU's College of Education and the Lansing Schools Education Association. The teachers and teacher educators who have nurtured and worked so very hard on this project are hopeful that new sets of prospective EEE teachers can be identified and that the program will become regularized as an on-going program of continuing professional development for elementary educators.

It is also hoped that the Teacher Corps segment of this project will continue. The Teacher Corps project is vital and essential in terms of its support and provision for development and demonstration activities in schools with a high number of children from low socio-economic families.

Further, Teacher Corp's total-school-involvement concept, paired with the EEE interns provides an especially unique opportunity to explore more fully the community-of-learners approach to in-service. Having the principal involved, (though the frequency of interruptions made continuity difficult) was a significant and important factor to the interns, teachers and teacher educators. Whether or not this possibility will be explored by other principals is in question, but it is hoped that they will elect to not only cooperate, but to participate as well - - to whatever extent possible.

The selection and evaluation committee(s) that have been recommended (with teachers, administrators, and university personnel) will hopefully be formed and proceed to address the significant and serious sets of questions in need of further attention. Specific guidelines and qualitative criteria need to be both established and upheld. Questions pursuant to issues such as school selection and/or clustering and/or transferring of personnel to participating schools should be considered, as well as questions of "making-space" and needed supplies available in schools for continuing in-service activity and on-going curriculum development.

Finally, there is a concern for sufficient and effective evaluation of such a multi-faceted program. Documenting the merits of such an innovation requires extensive analysis of ends as well as means and the myriad of interrelations among the ends and means. The task of selecting significant variables to assess and observe is haunting. Intensified support for evaluation personnel and activity is needed to assure that "what really matters" is indeed identified and described. We who have participated in various facets of the program's operation and planning believe that the model we have created is a viable and pragmatic one. We are hopeful that others will help us make it happen.

A FIRST YEARS EXPERIENCE WITH

TOTAL SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT

Prepared by Cindy Krolik and Barbara Jones
(with consultation from other Wainwright teachers)

Teacher Corps, with EEE,
Lansing Schools and Michigan
State University

May 25, 1976

Our inservicing is a product of Teacher Corps, a University, and a School District working together. We became involved with Cycle 10 Teacher Corps for a variety of reasons. Several members of our staff were involved with Cycle 8 Teacher Corps, but whether or not to participate in Cycle 10 became a total school decision. We are located about ten miles from the University with a teaching staff of twenty. For the past five years there has been very little turnover or mobility among our teachers. We looked forward to two vacant classrooms in the fall of 1975 (one currently houses the Teacher Corps interns and Clinic Professors and the other is our inservice classroom.) After we were approached by representatives from Teacher Corps, the University and the School District and our questions were answered as well as could be in terms of a developmental program, we voted to institute Cycle 10 Teacher Corps into our building. Included in this were twenty-one EEE interns, each assigned to a specific teacher through collaboration of the University people and our principal — though some accommodations were made later. Along with these were four Teacher Corps interns, hired by the Impact Study Team, who are also participating in the inservicing. They also take other college courses which will earn them a teaching certificate and participation as an intern next year. The Teacher Corps graduate interns also work with University instructors, and classroom teachers in the development of curriculum for four areas of study. These areas were written up in the proposal to Washington, D.C. and was approved by the Cycle 8 teachers prior to our total school's involvement and include reading, math, social emotional and multicultural education. One teacher elected not to participate and has not.

We made our decision to participate in spring of 1975 and agreed to begin our inservicing with a week-long workshop on campus the week prior

to the opening of school in the fall. (Some attended a summer conference in Washington, D.C.) At this workshop we worked with the concept and roles of educators along with some expectations and information about the program itself. Our teachers and the University personnel had the opportunity to meet one another and work together. We grouped and regrouped, asked and answered questions and when the week was up we had made some necessary and important decisions and were fueled up for our two years together. Choices here included which class to participate in for inservicing and committee participation. Teacher members of the Developmental Committees included those teachers who had worked with Teacher Corps the previous year in the area each has chosen to pursue. Teacher members of the Evaluation Committee included the two union representatives. The Community Component Committee also has two teacher members. Our principal, who is participating in the inservicing as well, is an active member of the latter two committees.

The EEE interns assigned to each teacher began the year with us. We met them our first day at school and they participated in the beginning planning. After about three weeks our inservicing began in our building with our classrooms manned by our own interns -- ideally. From time to time when a crisis arose a teacher would be needed in the classroom and would be available due to the location of our inservicing in our own building. During our first inservice class, which met two half days a week for ten weeks, we discussed what was termed "foundations." We read some Piaget and talked more about roles of human beings in our society, breaking these down into four: family member, career, citizen, and leisure time participant. There was much interaction with us all again

learning from readings and each other. At the end of this class some of the EEE interns were ready to begin their independent internship and others waited until spring term. The internships were related to the cooperating teachers' area of study. For example, all the teachers participating in one particular class had interns during the same term. Class time for those of us without interns winter term then needed to be negotiated for after school times. Therefore, two of the classes met right after school two nights a week, as was cooperatively decided. Having a winter intern gave the teachers more time for earlier development of curriculum and gave them their classrooms back in the spring to institute some of what they had developed.

According to responses to an in-building survey, the winter and spring term inservice classes in social emotional, multicultural, reading and math were viewed by most teachers as thought provoking and stimulating. "They introduced us to new points of view and teaching methods" and "helped even the more experienced teachers to update materials and methods" and to "re-examine and re-formulate our educational philosophies." Many teachers expressed the feeling that they finally were being given the opportunity to do something they had never done - sit down with their "colleagues", both in elementary and higher education, and make some decisions for curriculum change and development based upon experience, research, discussion and sometimes "healthy" argumentation about what constitutes an intelligent and humane approach to curriculum design.

In all four curriculum areas, it has been found to be imperative that goals and objectives for curriculum development be set as a group, taking into account the needs and expectations of individual members so

that each teacher can feel ownership in what the group is producing. Teachers have expressed the most satisfaction with the subject areas in which the greatest amount of open communication and the highest degree of parity exists among all members in establishing what the group hoped to accomplish within the somewhat limited time frame of twenty weeks. The original intention that teachers would research and develop one curriculum area the first year and "demonstrate" it to others the second year, while working on research and development for a second curriculum area, is currently being re-examined. Many teachers have expressed the need to stay with this year's subject to complete their work. Those teachers who had intended to work on all four curriculum areas in two years have found it to be very demanding on their time and energy, even though they have a EEE intern teacher assuming most of their regular teaching load. It is doubtful that a teacher should be encouraged to pursue more than one curriculum area at a time in the future, even though the teacher feels s/he would greatly benefit from having participated in all areas.

A further restriction on the amount of time that can be spent on curriculum development and change has arisen as a result of our present curriculum. Since our school district adopted "management by objectives" systems for both reading and math this year, teachers have had to become familiar with these objectives, the pre- and post-tests, and the different record-keeping systems that go with each set of objectives. Our building has not been "excused" from using these objectives, so teachers have been faced with getting to know and use the two mandatory sets of objectives while trying to develop our own curriculum goals. Much greater progress

could have been made in curriculum development without this added district burden on teachers' already crowded time schedules. It would seem to be very important to any teacher inservice program aiming at improved curriculum development that the attitude of the school system be carefully assessed to determine the extent to which the system can and will tolerate major departures from its already prescribed way of doing things. Many teachers have expressed their appreciation for the support that the Teacher Corps instructors and staff have given in attempting to "negotiate" with our school district for a solution to our dilemma of initiating and maintaining an existing curriculum while developing a new one. Since school system limitations and restrictions must necessarily be faced and dealt with, it appears that a two year program is a very short period of time in which to do a thorough and adequate job of curriculum development. It is hoped that some future changes will be made in federal guidelines to extend the time frame to accommodate such an ambitious undertaking.

As the school year has progressed, participants in the program have become increasingly aware of limitations of a two year program. The task of building research based curricula is not a simple or easy one, if it is to be done well. Study time, discussion time, development time, try-out time, and improve-upon time are all needed before worthwhile demonstration can occur. Accomplishing this task when faced with other needed and reasonable responsibilities is not easy; e.g., teaching children, conferring with parents, administrators and/or other teachers, observing and helping interns, etc. The suggestions and assistance of the University personnel was helpful, but they too have been "swamped" with reviewing research literature and materials, teaching the intern teachers and inservice classes,

developing curriculum units, observing and giving feedback, etc. The time needed for consultation and collaboration within and among all the different parties involved never seems to be enough.

There is no question that effective communication and organization becomes paramount when dealing with such large numbers of diverse people (teachers, interns, university and school system personnel, community members, teacher unions, etc.) while some of the organization and communication problems can be taken care of through careful and complete pre-planning, a certain number of problems can only be dealt with on a trial and error basis as they arise. It is expected that the communications and organization problems teachers have experienced this year will be solved as we learn from our mistakes how to communicate and organize more effectively.

This is especially true for the Community Component of Teacher Corps which involves communicating with and organizing large numbers of people both from within the program and from outside the school. Other program personnel should be kept informed and involved in what the Community Component is doing. Many teachers, including those on the Community Component Committee, feel uninformed and have expressed concern about what the Community Component is accomplishing. This might be remedied through a greater attempt to keep all component areas informed about what the other areas are doing. Maybe a quarterly "Newsletter" could facilitate this.

Another committee that has seemed to suffer due to time constraints is the Evaluation Committee. It has proven quite difficult to consistently assemble all members of this committee together in the same place at the same time. This might be solved by setting bi-monthly or quarterly

meeting dates at the beginning of the year so members could plan for that time to be free of other commitments. Teachers have expressed the desire to improve upon the four curriculum area evaluation instruments that are being given to teachers for the purpose of assessing the program - - not individuals.

Most of the teachers agree that a majority of the problem areas have arisen because this is a unique, new, and rather formidable undertaking for all of us. Since the program is still in its developmental stages, none of its participants have gone through exactly what they are experiencing now. Some of us have had experiences with similar programs, but a number of the classroom teachers, have had no prior experience with student teachers or interns, let alone in-service education, developing our own curriculum, trying to involve the total school community in a project of this scope, etc., etc. It is only through patience with each other, listening to each other, openly communicating our needs and meeting each others needs as best we can, and sharing our experiences both good and bad with others involved in similar projects that we can gain the knowledge and experience we need to produce a more intelligent and humane school environment for both students and educators.